

unless it also appears that the remedy by motion is inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention.

28 U.S.C. § 2255. *See Taylor v. United States Board of Parole*, 194 F.2d 882, 883 (D.C. Cir. 1952) (where petitioner attacked the constitutionality of the statute under which he was convicted and sentenced, the proper remedy was by motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255); *see also Ojo v. Immigration & Naturalization Service*, 106 F.3d 680, 683 (5th Cir. 1997) (the sentencing court is the only court with jurisdiction to hear defendant's complaint regarding errors that occurred before or during sentencing).

Petitioner has not moved for relief under § 2255, *see* Pet. at 3, and he has not shown the inadequacy of that remedy to test the legality of his detention. This Court therefore may not entertain the application for a writ of *habeas corpus*.¹

s/_____
Royce C. Lamberth
United States District Judge

Date: November 8, 2007

¹ A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.